

REMARKS

Claims 1-47 have been examined. Claims 1, 13-16, 19, 20, 24, 27, 31, and 42-45 have been rejected.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowance of claim 23, and for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2-12, 17, 18, 21, 25, 26, 28-30, 32-41, 46, and 47.

Claims 1, 13-16, 19, 20, 24, 27, 31, and 42-45 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Catthoor et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,223,274; hereinafter "Catthoor") in view of Brooks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,842,014; hereinafter "Brooks"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The claims are directed to a wireless communication method and system for hosting a plurality of processes, each process in the plurality of processes executed in accordance with a communication protocol, the communication protocol including a set of functions. The system has a plurality of application specific instruction set processors (ASISPs) and a scheduler or centralized controller. Each ASISP is capable of executing a subset of the set of functions included in the communication protocol. The scheduler or centralized controller is connected to the plurality of ASISPs for scheduling the plurality of ASISPs in accordance with a scheduling scheme or time-slicing algorithm so that each process in the plurality of processes is supported by the wireless communication system.

Catthoor and Brooks are each directed to a different system than the claimed invention. Catthoor is directed generally to a programmable processing engine. Brooks is directed to a digital signal processor system. On the other hand, the claims are directed to a wireless communication system and method. Wireless and wireline systems have very different architectures, and features of one system are not applicable to the other. The applied references are therefore not applicable to the claims of the present invention.

Further, the applied references do not suggest a “scheduler connected to said plurality of ASISPs for scheduling said plurality of ASISPs in accordance with a time-slicing algorithm,” as required by the claimed invention.

“Time-slicing algorithm” means that the scheduler interrupts each process after some small period of time (e.g., milliseconds) and gives control to another process. An example is provided in paragraph [0110], wherein at time-slice zero, scheduler 340 makes process A active, and at time-slice one, scheduler 340 makes process B the active process; the method continues in the same manner in subsequent time-slices.

In contrast, Brooks does not suggest a time-slicing algorithm. Brooks teaches a time-division multiplexing (TDM) algorithm. In TDM, multiple signals are transmitted sequentially by subdividing each time frame into “time slots.” The first signal is transmitted during a first time slot, a second signal is transmitted during a second time slot, and so on until all the signals have been transmitted. Thus, rather than time-slicing processes, as claimed, Brooks time-slices signals.

The claims are patentable over the applied references for at least this reason.

Dependent claims 13-16, 42 and 43 further recite various wireless protocols such as CDMA, IS-95 CDMA, IS-95B CDMA, CDMA TIA IS2000, TIA IS 2000A, wideband CDMA (WCDMA), cdma2000, and ARIB WCDMA, TDMA, and IS-136 TDMA. Since neither Catthoor nor Brooks suggests a wireless communication system, as discussed above, it necessarily follows that they do not suggest the specific wireless protocols as recited. Dependent claims 13-16, 42 and 43 are therefore patentable over the applied references for this additional reason.

Dependent claims 19, 20, 44, and 45 recite an “echo.” As explained in paragraph 52 of the published application, “The term echo is also used to refer to a multipath. Echoes are caused when the signal emitted from a transmitter ‘bounces’ off an object and arrives at the receiver through an alternate, delayed path.” Echo is a concept specific to wireless communication systems. Again, neither Catthoor nor Brooks suggests a wireless communication system, and thus it necessarily

follows that they do not suggest an echo, a concept specific to wireless communication systems. Dependent claims 19, 20, 44, and 45 are therefore patentable over the applied references for this additional reason.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the prior art rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

In the event a fee is required or if any additional fee during the prosecution of this application is not paid, the Patent Office is authorized to charge the underpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

Dated: March 23, 2009

Respectfully submitted,
/Laura C. Brutman/
By _____
Laura C. Brutman
Registration No.: 38,395
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant